

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 20, 2007. Claims 1 to 11 and 13 to 32 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 13, 14 and 28 to 32 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 12 was objected to for allegedly containing substantially similar subject matter as Claim 13. Without conceding the correctness of the objection. Claim 12 has been canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1 to 13, 28, 30 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,363,211 (Hasebe). Claims 14 to 16, 21 to 27, 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hasebe in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,459,586 (Nagasaki), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,389 (Imaizumi). Claims 17 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hasebe in view of Nagasaki, and in further view of JP 2000-261644 (Hideyuki). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns calculating an image movement amount and a magnification ratio using an arbitrary point of an image displayed in an image display area wherein the arbitrary point is dragged with a pointing device which is arranged to encircle the arbitrary point of the image displayed in the image display area and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image. In this manner, trimming of the displayed image can be performed by designating the displayed image and then moving the arbitrary point to a desired position by a pointing device.

Claims 1, 11 and 13

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an image editing method comprising the steps of instructing movement of an arbitrary point of an image displayed in an image display area, in accordance with the arbitrary point of the image being dragged with a pointing device which is arranged to encircle the arbitrary point of the image displayed in the image display area and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image; calculating an image movement amount and a magnification ratio in response to the instruction of the movement of the arbitrary point; and displaying a predetermined area of the image data in the image display area on the basis of image movement amount and the magnification ratio, which are calculated in the calculating step.

Amended independent Claims 11 and 13 are directed to an apparatus and a computer-readable recording medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that the applied reference, namely Hasebe, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 11 and 13. In particular, Hasebe is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of instructing movement of an arbitrary point of a displayed image in accordance with the arbitrary point of the image being dragged with a pointing device which is arranged to encircle the arbitrary point of the displayed image and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image, and calculating an image movement amount and a magnification ratio in response to the instruction of the movement of the arbitrary point to display a predetermined area of the image data based on a calculation result.

According to the present invention, a user can attain an optimum trimming of the image by adjusting the direction and distance while dragging the displayed image and viewing a preview of active trimming result displayed in accordance with the image being dragged.

Applicant submits that such a feature is not disclosed or suggested by Hasebe. Specifically, Hasebe fails to disclose or suggest instructing movement of an arbitrary point of a displayed image in accordance with the arbitrary point of the image being dragged with a pointing device which is arranged to encircle the arbitrary point of the displayed image and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image, as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 11 and 13. Therefore, Hasebe cannot possibly be seen to disclose or suggest calculating an image movement amount and a magnification ratio in response to such an instruction of the movement of the arbitrary point, as also recited in the amended Claims 1, 11 and 13. In this connection, it should be noted that the reference of Hasebe requires determining in advance a trimming area by markers and therefore can not attain to adjust trimming position and size while user is viewing a preview of active trimming result displayed in accordance with the image being dragged.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 11 and 13 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 14, 29 and 31

Independent Claim 14 is directed to an image editing method. The method comprises the steps of performing a trimming process on image data in a trimming mode; and displaying a grid on an image to be subjected to the trimming process, in response to the image being dragged by a pointing device which is arranged to encircle an arbitrary point of the image and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image, to perform the trimming process.

Applicant submits that Hasebe, Nagasato and Imaizumi, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of Claim 14. Specifically, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of arranging to displaying a grid on an image to be subjected to the trimming process, in response to the image being dragged by a pointing device which is arranged to encircle an arbitrary point of the image and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image, to perform the trimming process.

Both Hasebe and Nagasato fail to disclose or suggest performing a trimming process in accordance with a displayed image being dragged by a pointing device which is arranged to encircle an arbitrary point of the image and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image. Therefore, neither Hasebe nor Nagasato disclose or suggest displaying a grid on the image to be subjected to the trimming process, in response to the image being dragged by the pointing device, in order to perform the trimming process. Furthermore, in the Office Action Imaizumi is relied on as disclosing dragging of an image. However, Imaizumi fails to disclose dragging an image by a pointing device which is arranged to encircle an arbitrary point of the image and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image.

In light of the deficiencies of Hasebe, Nagasato and Imaizumi as discussed above, Applicant submits that Claim 14 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Independent Claims 29 and 31 are an apparatus and computer-executable program substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 29 and 31 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claims 28, 30 and 32

Amended independent Claim 28 is directed to an image editing method. The method comprises the steps of performing a trimming process on image data in a trimming mode and displaying, on an image to be subjected to the trimming process, a mark suggesting appropriate framing of a main object in the image, in response to the image being dragged by a pointing device which is arranged to encircle an arbitrary point of the image and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image, to perform the trimming process.

Applicant submits that the discussion from above in support of Claim 14 applies as well to Claim 28. Specifically, Hasebe fails to disclose or suggest performing a trimming process on image data in a trimming mode and displaying, on an image to be subjected to the trimming process, a mark suggesting appropriate framing of a main object in the image, in response to the image being dragged by a pointing device which is arranged to encircle an arbitrary point of the image and move the encircled arbitrary point of the image, to perform the trimming process.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 28 is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Independent Claims 30 and 32 are an apparatus and computer-executable program substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 28. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 30 and 32 are also in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional claim fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1845976v1